

III. REMARKS

Applicant has considered the current Office Action of mailing date January 26, 2007.

Claims 1-15 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 7, 14 and 15 have been amended.

Entry of this Amendment is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116(b) because the Amendment: (a) places the application in condition for allowance as discussed below; (b) does not raise any new issues requiring further search and/or consideration; and (c) places the application in better form for appeal. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully request entry of this Amendment.

In the Office Action, claims 1 – 15 are rejected under 35 USC §102(b), as being anticipated by Hennum et al. (US Patent No.: 6,259,445), hereafter “Hennum”.

Applicant does not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserves the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicant reserves the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration of the claimed invention is requested in view of the reasons set out in the following paragraphs.

With respect to the Office’s rejection of the claims based on Hennum under 35 USC §102(b), Applicant respectfully submits that Hennum does not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention and therefore does not anticipate the claimed invention. For example, with respect to independent claims 1, 7 and 13, Applicant submits that Hennum does not teach or suggest, *inter alia*, “the display interface simultaneously displays within a single screen a group of integrated windows comprising: a list of tutorial steps..., a source code window..., an explanation window” Specifically, col. 9, line 19 sets out explicitly that Hennum “... displays various screens to the user...” and not various windows within a single screen. Hennum also illustrates in FIGs. 16A – 16E, a list window 70, a text window 71 and an edit window 161 all of which are independent of each other. Since the windows are displayed in

separate windows that are not integrated in a single screen as in the claimed invention, Hennum does not teach the claimed limitation. As such Hennum does not anticipate the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the rejection and allow claim 1.

In view of the above arguments, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection. Applicant believes that the foregoing arguments apply to remaining independent claims 7 and 13 – 15 and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections under 35 USC §102(b).

In addition to the above, Applicant submits that all claims dependent from independent claims 1 and 7 are allowable for the reasons stated above as well as for their unique features. These features and the appropriateness of the Office's combinations and modifications have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However, Applicant reserves the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary.

IV. Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that anything further is necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/ John A. Merecki /

Dated: March 26, 2007

John A. Merecki
Reg. No. 35,812

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, NY 12207
(518) 449-0044 - Telephone
(518) 449-0047 - Facsimile
JAM/tc